

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application and for granting a telephonic interview to applicant's attorney. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action.

The interview occurred on June 25, 2009. The participants were Examiner Denise Tran and attorney Brad Spencer. Claims 30-32 and 37 were discussed during the interview, along with the drawing objections. Applicant's attorney agreed to amend the specification where appropriate to include references to Figs. 4-6.

A new paragraph has been added to the specification before the paragraph found on page 6, line 16, of the application. Support for this amendment can be found in original claims 14 and 15.

Objections to the Drawings

Figures 4-6 were objected to because detailed descriptions of Figs. 4-6 were not disclosed. The specification has been amended to include references to figures 4-6 where appropriate.

Figure 4 shows the step "provide a reserve area on storage device" and the paragraph at page 4, line 3 has been amended accordingly. Figure 4 shows the steps "receive a request to copy data or file," "fill read buffer," "check header for dual write command," "dual write flag or bit?" and "normal signal write" and the paragraph at page 5, line 10 has been amended accordingly. Figure 4 shows the step "check dual write command for address spread" and a new paragraph has been added accordingly. Figure 4 shows the step "write first copy and do not clear buffer, calculate second write location using address spread, write second copy" and the paragraph at page 5, line 19 has been amended accordingly.

Figure 5 shows the step “provide a reserve area on storage device that is not accessible by the operating system” and the paragraph at page 4, line 3 has been amended accordingly. Figure 5 shows the steps “receive a request to copy data or file,” “fill read buffer,” “check header for dual write command,” “dual write flag or bit?” and “normal signal write” and the paragraph at page 5, line 10 has been amended accordingly. Figure 5 shows the step “check dual write command for address spread” and a new paragraph has been added accordingly. Figure 5 shows the step “write first copy and do not clear buffer, calculate second write location using address spread, write second copy” and the paragraph at page 5, line 19 has been amended accordingly.

Figure 6 shows the step “provide a reserve area on storage device” and the paragraph at page 4, line 3 has been amended accordingly. Figure 6 shows the steps “receive a request to copy data or file,” “fill read buffer,” “dual write flag or bit?” and “normal signal write” and the paragraph at page 5, line 10 has been amended accordingly. Figure 6 shows the step “check hard drive firmware command for dual write command” and the paragraph at page 6, line 4 has been amended accordingly. Figure 6 shows the step “check dual write command for address spread” and a new paragraph has been added accordingly. Figure 6 shows the step “write first copy and do not clear buffer, calculate second write location using address spread, write second copy” and the paragraph at page 5, line 19 has been amended accordingly.

In view of the amendments to the specification, applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the drawings containing Figs. 4-6 be withdrawn.

The drawings were objected to for allegedly not showing every feature of the claimed subject matter. Regarding claim 14, the limitation “an address spread within the dual write command” is shown in Figs. 4-6. Regarding claim 30, this claim has been canceled in the current amendment. Regarding claim 32, the limitation “the dual write command is a hard drive

firmware command” is shown in Fig. 6. Regarding claim 37, the limitation “wherein the reserve area is not accessible by the operating system” is shown in Fig. 5. In view of the discussion above, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

The Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application if any further drawing issues are perceived.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Paterson. Claim 30 has been canceled.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paterson in view of Cheston. Claim 31 has been canceled.

Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paterson in view of Assaf. Claim 32 has been amended to depend from allowed claim 1. Accordingly, claim 32 is also allowable.

Applicant appreciates the indicated allowability of claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 11-14, 16, 17, 19, 33 and 35 -37.

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. ACER-45202.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: /Brad C Spencer/
Brad C. Spencer – Reg. No. 57,076

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: July 7, 2009